UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,306	06/22/2001	Rogelio Robles	10990665-1	6814

7590	01/23/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/887,306	ROBLES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CESAR B. PAULA	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 November 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-9,11-24,26-29,31,34-37 and 39* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7-9,11-24,26-29,31,34-37 and 39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20060117

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 11/9/2005.

This action is made Final.

2.   In the amendment, claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-24, 26-29, 31, 34-37, and 39 are pending in the

case. Claims 1, 9, 19, and 29 are independent claims.

3.   The rejections of claims 19-23, 26-29, 31, 34, 36-37, and 39 rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Der linden et al, hereinafter Vanderlinden (US Pub.#

2001/0013947 A1, 8/16/2001, filed 12/28/2000, Foreign EPO application filed on 1/4/2000),

have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Drawings

4.   The drawings filed on 6/22/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section
> 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to
> which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-5, 7-9, and 11-18 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Vanderlinden.

Regarding independent claim 1, Vanderlinden discloses the submission of print jobs to a

reproduction center using a submission form, which is displayed by a remote browser, has pull-

down menus, and control buttons for selecting printers, and print options, and submitting the

print job —*a first user interface with user accessible controls for selecting services for*

producing a production request captured on the remote computing device-- (0038-0046, fig.,3).

Moreover, Vanderlinden teaches the editing or changing of the submission form's pull-

down menu to update functionalities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a

new printer to a reproduction center, whose capabilities are added to a pull-down menu for

selecting the printer having the new functionality, as a result of the addition of a new printer

capable of printing documents on transparent media. The updated information is placed, and

displayed in the form's pull-down menu using a browser —*presenting to the remote computing*

device, a second user interface having user accessible controls for selecting one or more, if any,

document production devices identified as being capable of providing services selected through

the first user interface -- (0016, 0041, 0051, 0059, fig.3).

Furthermore, Vanderlinden discloses that after the user has selected several print options,

a "job ticket" —*production plan*-- is produced from the submission form containing the various

options selected by the user—*merging the selected services and the captured production request*

into a production plan. The "job ticket" is then uploaded to a server, and to the selected printer

for completing the print request—*delivering the production plan to one or more selected*

document production devices selected through the second user interface (0035, 0042-0043,

0047-0049,005-0052, 0056). Vanderlinden fails to explicitly disclose: *delivering the production*

plan in a device specific format. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to have delivered the plan in a device specific format,

because Vanderlinden teaches above routing job tickets to a printer capable of executing the job

at the lowest possible costs. Thus printing documents at a minimum price at a printer which

understands and is able to carry out the print request.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Vanderlinden teaches the changing of the

submission form to update capabilities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a

new printer to a pull-down menu as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing

transparent media (0051).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Vanderlinden teaches a submission form

for selecting of printers, including those to be included in the updated submission form including

capabilities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a new printer to a pull-down

menu as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing transparent (0051).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 2, Vanderlinden teaches the changing of the

submission form to update capabilities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a

new printer to a pull-down menu as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing

transparent (0051). In other words, when the new printer is detected or queried by the client computer, then the update will take place on the submission form.

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 2, Vanderlinden teaches the changing of the submission form to update capabilities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a new printer to a pull-down menu as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing transparent. The updated printer information is obtained from a device capability store— *querying a services database* (0051, 0059).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Vanderlinden teaches the changing of the submission form to update functionalities available at the reproduction center, such as the adding a new printer to a pull-down menu for selecting the printer, as a result of the addition of a new printer capable of printing transparent (0016, 0051, 0059, fig.3).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Vanderlinden teaches the display of a list of all pending print jobs along with their current status, such as waiting, being printed, or is completed (0056-0059). In other words, the status is monitored to determine the progress of the print job, and then that status is displayed on the list.

Claims 9, 11-14 are directed towards a computer program product on a computer-readable medium for storing the steps found in claims 1-5 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 14, Vanderlinden discloses the submission

form includes messages for displaying the change in printing devices capabilities as a result of

updates made to the device capabilities store—*services database updated with services not*

currently represented in this database-- (0059-0060).

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 15, Vanderlinden discloses the submission

form includes messages for displaying the change in printing devices capabilities as a result of

updates made to the device capabilities store—*services database updated with services not*

currently represented in this database—such as the addition of new printers—*services not*

available on the network and services database and updating the database with the new printer

added to the reproduction center (0051, 0059-0060).

Claims 17-18 are directed towards a computer program product on a computer-readable

medium for storing the steps found in claims 7-8 respectively, and therefore are similarly

rejected.

7.   Claims 19-24, 26-29, 31, 34-37, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Suzuki et al, hereinafter Suzuki (USPat. 6,477,589, 11/5/2002, filed on

3/15/1999), in view of Keeney et al, hereinafter Keeny (USPub # 2004/0148335 A1, 7/29/2004,

continuation 10/16/2000.

Regarding independent claim 19, Suzuki discloses a software image which allows a user

to print processing to be started by selecting a "print" option—*capture driver operable to*

capture the document production request—a first user interface with user accessible controls for

selecting services for producing a production request captured on the remote computing device-

—for sending a print job to a printer from a personal computer over a network(col.6, lines 37-67,

col.19, lines 7-67, fig.1).

Moreover, Suzuki teaches displaying candidate devices, which meet a certain criteria,

upon the selection of an option regarding the certain criteria on the software image —*second*

user interface having user accessible controls for selecting one or more, if any, document

production devices identified as being capable of providing services selected through the first

user interface -- (col.19, lines 27-67, col.21, lines 57-col.22, line 67).

Furthermore, Suzuki teaches a window for selecting candidate devices, such as printers,

meeting certain setting conditions, and a software automatically displaying candidates meeting

the specified condition-- *automatically identify the one or more, if any, production devices,*

capable of providing the service selection to generate and provide the second user interface to

the production client, and to receive selections made through the second user interface (col.19,

lines 23-53, col.20, lines 57-col.22, line 67). Suzuki fails to explicitly teach *a production server*

in electronic communication with the production client and operable to direct one or more

selected document production devices to produce the captured production request with selected

services, the production server comprising: a services engine ....a production engine operable to

deliver the captured production request to a production device or devices selected through the

second user interface. However, Keeny discloses a server—*production server*—which is

connected with a client via a network, for routing the print job according to the requested print

locations—*direct one or more selected document production devices to produce the captured*

document (0022-0028, 0037). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention to have combined Suzuki, and Keeny, because Keeny teaches a

secure, reliable, efficient, and easy-to-configure printing method through a firewall without the

intervention of a network administrator (0019-0020). This would also provide the benefit of

securely and efficiently submit print jobs to a printer over a network.

Regarding claim 20, which depends on claim 19, Suzuki discloses a software image

which allows a user to print processing to be started by selecting a "print" option for sending a

print job to a printer from a personal computer over a network(col.6, lines 37-67, col.19, lines 7-

67, fig.1). Suzuki fails to explicitly disclose *to transform the production request into a selected*

format and to transfer the formatted production request to the production server. However,

Keeny discloses the conversion of a document to a pre-printing format, such as Postscript printer

language to be submitted to the server (0022-0028, 0037, 0121). It would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Suzuki, and

Keeny, because Keeny teaches a secure, reliable, efficient, and easy-to-configure printing

method through a firewall without the intervention of a network administrator (0019-0020). This

would also provide the benefit of securely and efficiently submit print jobs to a printer over a

network.

Regarding claim 21, which depends on claim 19, Suzuki discloses a software image

which allows a user to print processing to be started by selecting a "print" option for sending a

print job to a printer from a personal computer over a network(col.6, lines 37-67, col.19, lines 7-

67, fig.1). Suzuki fails to explicitly disclose *the client interface is a web browser.* However,

Keeny discloses the print job originating from a client having a web browser —*interface*

translator-- (0024). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to have combined Suzuki, and Keeny, because Keeny teaches a secure, reliable,

efficient, and easy-to-configure printing method through a firewall without the intervention of a

network administrator (0019-0020). This would also provide the benefit of securely and

efficiently submit print jobs to a printer over a network, such as the Internet.

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 19, Suzuki teaches a window for selecting

candidate devices, such as printers, meeting certain setting conditions, and a software

automatically finding, and displaying candidates meeting the specified condition—*identify*

services available on the network-- (col.19, lines 23-53, col.20, lines 57-col.22, line 67).

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 22, Suzuki teaches a unit list table—

database of known services-- storing device information regarding the devices connected to the

network (col.20, lines 9-67). Suzuki fails to explicitly teach the production server. However,

Keeny discloses a server—*production server*—which is connected with a client via a network,

for routing the print job according to the requested print locations—*direct one or more selected*

document production devices to produce the captured document (0022-0028, 0037). It would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have

combined Suzuki, and Keeny, because Keeny teaches a secure, reliable, efficient, and easy-to-

configure printing method through a firewall without the intervention of a network administrator

(0019-0020). This would also provide the benefit of securely and efficiently submit print jobs to

a printer over a network.

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 23, Suzuki teaches obtaining registration

information about the devices from a unit list table, and ROMs of all the devices, storing device

information regarding the devices connected to the network-- *querying the document production*

devices (col.20, lines 9-67).

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 19, Suzuki teaches obtaining registration

information about the devices from a unit list table, and ROMs of all the devices, storing device

information regarding the devices connected to the network (col.20, lines 9-67). Suzuki fails to

explicitly teach *a production queue*. However, Keeny discloses a queue, located on the server,

for storing one or more print jobs(0077). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Suzuki, and Keeny, because Keeny

teaches a secure, reliable, efficient, and easy-to-configure printing method through a firewall

without the intervention of a network administrator (0019-0020). This would also provide the

benefit of securely and efficiently submit print jobs to a printer over a network.

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 26, Suzuki teaches obtaining registration information about the devices from a unit list table, and ROMs of all the devices, storing device information regarding the devices connected to the network (col.20, lines 9-67). Suzuki fails to explicitly teach *a production manager in electronic communication with the production queue.* However, Keeny discloses the queue, located on the server, is maintained by a trusted party (0074, 0077). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Suzuki, and Keeny, because Keeny teaches a secure, reliable, efficient, and easy-to-configure printing method through a firewall without the intervention of a network administrator (0019-0020). This would also provide the benefit of securely and efficiently submit print jobs to a printer over a network.

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 19, Suzuki teaches obtaining registration information about the devices from a unit list table, and ROMs of all the devices, storing device information regarding the devices connected to the network (col.20, lines 9-67). Suzuki fails to explicitly teach *a server locator.* However, Keeny discloses communications between the client and the server (0078). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Suzuki, and Keeny, because Keeny teaches a secure, reliable, efficient, and easy-to-configure printing method through a firewall without the intervention of a network administrator (0019-0020). This would also provide the benefit of securely and efficiently submit print jobs to a printer over a network.

Regarding independent claim 29, Suzuki teaches displaying candidate devices, which

meet a certain criteria, upon the selection of an option regarding the certain criteria on a client

computer's software image —*production devices capable of providing the selected services, and*

obtain a selection of one or more of the identified production devices from the production client,

and print options for performing printing—*one or more services for producing a producing*

request, deliver the captured request to a selected production client-- (col.19, lines 27-67, col.21,

lines 57-col.22, line 67).

Furthermore, Suzuki teaches a window for selecting candidate devices, such as printers,

meeting certain setting conditions, and a software automatically displaying candidates meeting

the specified condition-- *automatically identify one or more, if any, production devices capable*

of providing the selected services (col.19, lines 23-53, col.20, lines 57-col.22, line 67).

Regarding claim 31, which depends on claim 30, Suzuki discloses a software image

which allows a user to print processing to be started by selecting a "print" option for sending a

print job to a printer from a personal computer over a network(col.6, lines 37-67, col.19, lines 7-

67, fig.1). Suzuki fails to explicitly teach deliver the production plan in a device specific *generic*

format However, Keeny discloses the conversion of a document to a pre-printing format, such as

Postscript printer language to be submitted to the server (0022-0028, 0037, 0121). It would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined

Suzuki, and Keeny, because Keeny teaches a secure, reliable, efficient, and easy-to-configure

printing method through a firewall without the intervention of a network administrator (0019-

0020). This would also provide the benefit of securely and efficiently submit print jobs to a printer over a network.

Regarding claim 34, which depends on claim 29, Suzuki teaches obtaining registration information about the devices from a unit list table—*querying the services database* --, and ROMs of all the devices, storing device information regarding the devices connected to the network (col.20, lines 9-67).

Regarding claim 35, which depends on claim 34, Suzuki teaches obtaining registration information about the devices from a unit list table, and ROMs of all the devices—*querying document production devices* --, storing device information regarding the devices connected to the network (col.20, lines 9-67).

Regarding claim 36, which depends on claim 34, Suzuki discloses adding, and updating information about a device available on the network—*update the services available on the document production devices but not currently represented in the services database*-- (col.20, lines 9-67).

Regarding claim 37, which depends on claim 36, Suzuki discloses adding, and updating —*identification new devices*-- information about a device available on the network (col.20, lines 9-67).

Claim 39 is directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in

claim 27, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments filed 11/9/2005 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. Applicants note that Vanderlinden describes the addition of an option to a pulldown

menu, and not a printer (page 9). The rejection has been clarified to indicate that whenever a new

printer is added to the reproduction center, new options are added so as to indirectly select a

printer to print documents, such as the printing of documents onto transparencies.

Regarding independent claim 1, Applicants submit that Vanderlinden does not disclose or

suggest the selection of services (page 16). As it has been indicated above, Vanderlinden

discloses this feature as recited in the claim.

9.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 19, and 29 have been considered but

are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding independent claim 19, Applicants submit that Vanderlinden does not show the

amended limitation of automatically generating a second interface that identify production

devices capable of providing specific services (page 11). As indicated above, this newly added

limitation is taught by the combination of Suzuki, and Keeny.

Regarding independent claim 29, Applicants indicate that Vanderlinden does not show

the amended limitation of automatically identifying production devices (pages 13, and 15). The

Applicants are directed towards the rejection of this newly added limitation taught above by the

Suzuki, and Keeny.

Claims 9, 24, and 35 remain rejected at least for the same reasons established above.

Conclusion

10.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

I.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. Munson et al. (Pat. # 6,741,262 B1), Whitmarsh et al. (Pat. # 2002/0145627 A1),

Tonkin (USPub 2005/0015392), and Sanchez et al. (Pat. # 5,832,298 A).

II.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

(EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please

allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, go to http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair. Should you have any questions about

access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866

217-9197 (toll-free).

         Any response to this Action should be mailed to:
                 Commissioner for Patents
                 P.O. Box 1450
          Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
         Or faxed to:
- **(571)-273-8300 (for all** Formal communications intended for entry)

CESAR PAULA   1/19/06

PRIMARY EXAMINER